

## REMARKS

### Summary

Claims 1-9 were pending. Claims 1 and 4-7 have been rewritten and Claims 10-20 added. No new matter has been added as a result of this amendment.

### Objection to Claims

Claims 1 and 4-7 were objected to for various reasons. Applicant has rewritten Claims 1 and 4-7 and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objection to the claims in the next Office Action.

### Rejection of Claims

Claims 1 and 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Itoh (5,841,496); Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Itoh in view of Uchida (6,805,925); Claims 4-7 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Itoh in view of Meyerhofer (3,905,682); and Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Itoh in view of Meyerhofer and further in view of Uchida. Applicant has rewritten Claim 1 and traverses the rejection of amended Claim 1.

Claim 1 recites that the optical diffusion layer has fine particles dispersed therein. Itoh does not anticipate or disclose such an arrangement.

In addition, Claim 1 recites that the reflection substrate is provided with a plurality of reflection inclined planes continuously formed on a surface thereof with a stripe geometry in plan view. A surface of each refection inclined plane is provided with concave portions having a depth within a range of 0.3  $\mu$ m to 3  $\mu$ m irregularly. Adjacent concave portions are arranged irregularly at a pitch between 1  $\mu$ m and 30  $\mu$ m.

The range of depths of the concave portions permits the apexes of the convex portions to be sufficiently buried and the desired flatness to be obtained along with adequate reflection characteristics. Similarly, the pitch range disclosed permits adequate reflection characteristics to be formed with

limited light interference and sufficiently small working time in preparation of the transcription mold used to form the reflection inclined planes.

Itoh does not anticipate or disclose specifics of the concave portions that include the depth and pitch, as recited in Claim 1.

For at least these reasons, Itoh does not anticipate or disclose the arrangement of Claim 1. Thus, Claim 1 is patentable over the references cited by the Examiner.

Claim 4 was rejected as being unpatentable over Itoh and Meyerhofer. For at least similar reasons, neither Itoh nor Meyerhofer anticipate or suggest the arrangement of Claim 4. Thus, Claim 4 is patentable over the references cited by the Examiner.

Dependent Claims 2-3 and 5-9 are dependent upon allowable claims. Thus, the dependent claims are thus allowable, without more.

Similarly, new Claims 10-20 are patentable over the cited references. For example, none of the references anticipates or suggests an arrangement in which the haze of the optical diffusion layer is at least 15% and less than 20%. Nor do any of the references anticipate or suggests an arrangement that specifies the particle diameter of the fine particles (1  $\mu\text{m}$  to 20  $\mu\text{m}$  or 3  $\mu\text{m}$  to 15  $\mu\text{m}$ ), additive rate of the fine particles to a matrix in which the fine particles are contained (0.1 mass% and 10 mass%) or structure of the fine particles. Accordingly, none of the cited references anticipate or suggest the arrangements of Claims 10-20. Thus, Claims 10-20 are patentable over the cited references.

## Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. If for any reason the Examiner is unable to allow the application in the next Office Action and believes that a telephone interview would be helpful to resolve any remaining issues, she is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Anthony P. Curtis, Ph.D.  
Registration No. 46,193  
Attorney for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE  
P.O. BOX 10395  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610  
(312) 321-4200